



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/083,574	02/27/2002	Seiji Kozono	Q68729	5897
23373	7590	11/01/2004	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			VU, HIEN D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2833	

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/083,574

Applicant(s)

KOZONO ET AL.

Examiner

Hien D. Vu

Art Unit

2833

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 July 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2833

1. The new proposed drawings were received on 7/6/04. These drawings are accepted.
2. The Patent and Trademark Office no longer makes drawing changes. See 1017 O.G. 4.

It is applicant's responsibility to ensure that the drawings are corrected. Corrections must be made in accordance with the instructions below.

3. **INFORMATION ON HOW TO EFFECT DRAWING CHANGES**

Replacement Drawing Sheets

Drawing changes must be made by presenting replacement figures which incorporate the desired changes and which comply with 37 CFR 1.84. An explanation of the changes made must be presented either in the drawing amendments, or remarks, section of the amendment. Any replacement drawing sheet must be identified in the top margin as "Replacement Sheet" (37 CFR 1.121(d)) and include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even though only one figure may be amended. The figure or figure number of the amended drawing(s) must not be labeled as "amended." If the changes to the drawing figure(s) are not accepted by the examiner, applicant will be notified of any required corrective action in the next Office action. No further drawing submission will be required, unless applicant is notified.

Identifying indicia, if provided, should include the title of the invention, inventor's name, and application number, or docket number (if any) if an application number has not been assigned to the application. If this information is provided, it must be placed on the front of each sheet and centered within the top margin.

Annotated Drawing Sheets

A marked-up copy of any amended drawing figure, including annotations indicating the changes made, may be submitted or required by the examiner. The annotated drawing sheets must be clearly labeled as "Annotated Marked-up Drawings" and accompany the replacement sheets.

Timing of Corrections

Applicant is required to submit acceptable corrected drawings within the time period set in the Office action. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Failure to take corrective action within the set period will result in ABANDONMENT of the application.

If corrected drawings are required in a Notice of Allowability (PTOL-37), the new drawings **MUST** be filed within the **THREE MONTH** shortened statutory period set for reply in the "Notice of Allowability." Extensions of time may **NOT** be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 for filing the corrected drawings after the mailing of a Notice of Allowability.

4. The rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 112 is persuasive and is withdrawn.
5. Claim 9 is objected to because in claim 9, lines 15-18, the features the lack canceller....said second position” are duplicate.
6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
7. (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
8. Claims 1, 4, 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Pederson et al (115).

Insofar as the claims can be understood, the disclosure of Pederson provides a complete response to each and every element set forth in the claims. For example: Figs. 1-3 and 10a-10d show a first housing 12 with a projection 40, a second housing 14, a retainer 84, an engagement detector 16, a lock canceller 72, an engagement detector held in the second housing and slidable between the first position as shown in fig. 10a and a second position as shown in fig. 10b-c, and the engagement detector and the retainer are moved to a third position at which the engagement detector is allowed to be forcibly moved to the first position as shown in fig. 10c.

As to claim 4, a wall 76 read as the recited cover portion.

As to claim 5, an inner groove (not labeled) in the cover portion 76 for receiving the engagement detector read as the recited notch.

As to claim 9, the claimed limitations are substantially corresponding to the connector claim 1, therefore it is rejected under the similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2833

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pederson et al in view of Kouda et al.

Pederson does not show the second housing having a stopper for limit the range of movement of the lock canceller. Kouda, fig. 4f shows a connector housing 11 having a projection 17 that reads as the recited stopper. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the connector of Pederson by providing the second connector housing with a stopper, as taught by Kouda, in order to prevent over limited movement of the lock canceller.

As to claim 7, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the connector of Pederson et al in view of Kouda et al by providing a stopper on the lock canceller instead on the housing. Since such change produces same result and would have been obvious of reversal parts in order to achieve the desire of location.

As to claim 8, Kouda shows the stopper extending upwardly from an end of the second housing and is positioned between the lock canceller and the second housing.

10. Applicant's arguments filed 7/6/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to the remarks on page 9, applicant states that Pederson does not teach or suggest the engagement detector and the retainer to be moved to a third position at which the engagement detector is allowed to be forced move to the first position. The Examiner disagrees.

Art Unit: 2833

Fig. 10b & C of Pederson clearly show the engagement detector 16 with a hook 110 and the retainer 84 to be moved to a third position at which the engagement detector 16 is allowed to be forced to the first position.

The other remarks are considered to be fully addressed in the rejection of the claims above.

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Hien Vu at telephone number (571) 272-2016.

Vu/ds

10/07/04


HIEN VU
PRIMARY EXAMINER